

## **REMARKS**

Claims 6, 12, 36, 46, 69, 74, 78, 80, and 88 have been amended. Claims 2-7, 9-13, 36-59, and 69-95 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the application be forwarded on to issuance.

### **Interview Summary**

Applicant's representative, Lance Sadler, wishes to thank Examiner Dennis Bonshock for the telephone interview conducted on November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

During the interview, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the 35 U.S.C. 103 and 112 rejections:

### **35 U.S.C. 112 Rejections**

Claims 2-7, 9-13, 36-59, and 69-95 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that amending the independent claims by deleting "clicking and dragging" and adding "using the a cursor controlled by the user" would overcome the 112 rejections. Accordingly, in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant has made the amendments suggested by the Office. Support for this amendment can be found on page 13 of Applicant's specification, which teaches: "the user *selects, with their cursor, a portion of the text* that they believe to be spelled incorrectly." Applicant notes that this amendment was made solely in the interest of advancing prosecution and that selecting text by "clicking and dragging" is fully/inherently supported by the specification.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the 112 rejections should be withdrawn.

### **35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections**

Applicant has amended independent claims 6, 12, 36, 46, 69, 74, 78, 80, and 88 by clarifying that "said at least one command is selectable by the user to perform actions on the selected text portions." Support for this amendment can be found on page 21 of Applicant's specification, which teaches that: "context blocks are advantageously "modeless" meaning that any action taken by the user is immediately applied to the user's

selection in the document.” During the interview, the examiner indicated that this amendment would overcome the Samar reference, and would likely make the claims allowable over the art of record. However, the examiner stated that he would have to review the other references of record to ensure that this element is not disclosed.

5           Accordingly, Applicant’s representative understood the Examiner to consider the claims as amended allowable over the art of record but indicated that the allowance of the claims is subject to an additional search.

Applicant respectfully requests a phone call if the Examiner thinks there are any further issues that might delay issuance.

10

### **Conclusion**

15           All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Office issue a Notice of Allowability. If the Office’s next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

20

Dated: 12/27/2007

By: /Lance R. Sadler/  
Lance R. Sadler  
Reg. No. 38605  
(509) 755-7251